Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0495MI-1 for Edison Public School Academy

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- Through a personalized learning system, teacher and leader management system and professional development opportunites, the applicant expects to identify and address gaps in student proficiency on measured interim assessments and differentiated learning strategies, provide assessment tools that identify learning styles, college and career goals, and highlight academic interests, train educators to implement differentiated instructional practices, reinforce career and college readiness standards through the creation of professional learning communities, and recruit and retain high quality staff by providing an incentive system for teachers liked to student outcomes. The applicant plans to implement data systems that measure student growth and success and inform teachers and parents to improve instruction there is little information to support their capacity to build upon existing data systems. More information is needed to support the rationale to develop such a system. Because all schools in the consortium have yet to be identified, it is difficult to determine the applicant's plan in turning around the lowest achieving schools.
- Data provided to support logical approach to the development of a personalized learning system is provided, implementation of research based evaluation model for instruction and leadership is referenced, and professional development related to assessment and differentiated instruction is noted.
- Research provided to support theory of change model
- Noted reference to identifying achievement gaps, implementing assessement procedures, professional development for staff to assist in reinforcing career and college readiness standards
- Baseline data on existing programs and a clear articulation of succes is limited. Target information insufficient to address credible and achievable reform.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Participating schools selection process based on a shared vision and experience. For example, participating schools share a similar foundational belief and vision to evaluate the impact of identifying achievement gaps, implementation of assessment tools, Professional Development opportunities focused on differentiated instruction and establishment of PLC's to address career and readiness standards.
- The applicant suggest that each participating school shares similiar foundational beliefs regarding effective education based on individualized learning and a human capital management system to employ highly qualified effective teachers, however, more detail is needed to address the nature of these beliefs and how these foundational beliefs will be addressed in individual schools to support school school-level implementation.
- Complete list of the eleven participating schools with descriptors of program success is provided: however the number of low income students participating from individual schools varies between twenty-five and one hundred percent. The average number of low income students participating is sixty-five percent. One participating school noted a high ELL population however percentages were not included. The remaining participating schools do not have demographic profiles attached.

	Available	Score
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- Information provided to support the relationship regarding the implementation of individualized learning plans for each

- student, professional development of staff, and improved instruction and leadership with an incentive system to sustain the vision of the project long term: support of theory of change and elements of a high quality plan
- Evidence to support improved student achievement through personalized learning, professional development for staff, identifying the learning styles of students, and reinforcing careeer and college readiness standards : data collection measures proposed to create baseline data with target performance monitors
- Theory of change does not reflect or support the achievement of summative goals of the project
- In depth explanation of the elements of the RISE Program needed to demonstrate evidence in support of meaningful reform
- Plan focuses on specific schools: complete explanation related to improvement throughout entire consortium is undefined

	Available	Score
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- Lacks differentiation of performance data goal expectations as Professional Development opportunities are completed. Greater level of progress is expected as training is accomplished: previous year score +5% during first three years of plan does not allow for differentiated rate of growth as related to progressive growth of individual subgroups: rationale for selected criteria is needed
- Individual school data related to closing achievement gap is not noted
- Differentiation of subgroups as related to achievement gap is unavailable for each individual school
- No evidence is present regarding college enrollment data
- Research based evidence of the positive impact of differentiated instruction on the mastery of course content is cited
- Noted frequency of summative assessment implementation including required state assessment and interim
- Based on the information provided in the proposal, it is likely that student learning and performance will improve, however, historical data related to past success and the current status in meeting the criteria is not provided.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	3

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- Insufficient reporting of prior success of each school in applicable subject area: lacks evidence of subgroup achievement
- Unclear specific reporting for lowest achieving schools: limited examples of noted success in some of the schools: key progress indicators for each school are not reported
- Student management system (Powerschool) provides parents and students with basic data related to grades, attendance and assignments: capability of system to track student growth indicators in unclear: a comprehensive system manager would make it simple for parents to access progress indicators and personalized learning plans: performance data is not presented or shared effectively through a variety of sources: No indication that performance is shared with the governing bodies of individual schools, advisory committees, or the community.
- Performance data related to student growth over time is unavailable

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Required reporting of budget and personnel salaries completed through state reporting procedures in accordance with statutory regulations: infomation is not public: data not included in application
- No evidence of public reporting through technological resources or website of individual partcipants is included in this application
- Specific data related to certification of staff is available at the state level
- Compensation information available at the state level
- The access point for district expenditures, including instruction, support services, business and administration and operations and maintenance (non-instructional) is present on the school's website: the applicant does not provide

additional information regarding LEA processes or practices in the proposal.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- Participants in the consortium have been granted status of LEA by the Department of Education: Autonomy to direct the delivery of education deemed most effective governs each academy (80.501 public School Academy Scope, Powers, and Definitions). The Board of Directors with the autonomy to direct the delivery of education in a manner deemed most effective governs the PSA. Autonomy allows for the ability to be flexible and adaptive in order to achieve performance expectations.
- The applicant provided examples related to its use of the granted flexibility in the form of an extended school year and schedule changes.
- The applicant provided no evidence related to a school governance council at each participating school to address the needs and oversee the programming changes of the proposal.
- Application deemed incomplete by the State Department of Education with regard to the alignment of state initiatives: documentation included in the Appendix of the application.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	4

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- Evidence of staff participation/support: signature pages of staff from participating schools included in Appendix: non-collective bargaining
- Acknowledgement of the importance of collaboration is noted however the proposed evidence of stakeholder involvement in unclear. Schools with strong parent teacher organizations will encourage participation however there is not mention of the procedure or strategy to increase involvement of parents in schools with sparse parental participation
- Plan seeks to create a core group for each stakeholder group to ensure that buy-in and collaboration is maintained but does not specify individuals in the core group or core group selection standards
- Application deemed incomplete by State Department of Education in alignment of state initiatives: documentation included in Appendix
- Support letters from teachers included in Appendix: one hundred percent support is noted

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	4

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

- Percentage ranking of 2011-2012 Top to Bottom is inadequate data to support effective vision with positive results: detailed growth overtime would be helpful in determining achievement and progress
- Experience and evidence based results are not included for all schools participating: three schools are noted to be in the top five percent of performing schools and classified as Reward Schools, sixty percent of the participating schools are placed below the fifty percent on the Top to **B**ottom list. Based upon information provided related to all schools in the consortium sharing a vision, this is evidence of inconsistent performance indicators that support the need for a strong framework to support a shared vision focused on individualized learning.
- Each participant has a form of an individual learning model in place. A clear management plan for each model in each school is not provided. Student performance in each participating school is based on evidence provided from the Top to Bottom List indicates that a shared vision does not equate with meeting past performance expectations.
- The applicant notes that a clear management plan, not currently in place, will be developed based on findings of the consortium. It is the intent of the proposal to support innovation while providing necessary supportive framework. The application lacks evidence of the current status in implementing personalized learning environments. Specific evidence based performance results are not included, therefore identified needs and gaps are not addressed.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score

(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	17

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- Evidence to support individualized learning approach with the support of differentiated instruction to enhance state requirements and address the needs of all students is included
- ILP to support academic interest of individual students to drive instruction: research support documentation included
- Mastery indicators unclear: thorough explanation of the use of Performance Management System is needed to address and monitor progress
- Vague description of the process for stakeholder monitoring of progress, goal setting process, goal attainment
- Specific examples of implentation within curricula noted: evidence of specific integrated supporting curricula utilized by participants is clear
- Documented prior experience of procedures in developing Educational Development Plan to span seventh grade through high school. Essential requirements, including demographic information, career goals, education goals, assessment results, and plan of action are included. The proposed plan builds upon EDP principles and expands them to encompass all students grades K-12 with the addition of developing ILP's with individual students as the facilitator or progress for older students. Differentiation in age level development includes using motivators that lead to an appreciation of learning for younger students. This philosopy is supported through the use of career inventories and mentors in creating clear career and academic plans of action. The plan also accounts for elements of developing supportive curriculum to address student interest and utilizing the strength of staff members in the development and implementation of student ILP to meet the needs of students.
- Activities with timelines provided as evidence to update individual ILP and provide staff and parents with effective monitoring tools.   For example, academic assessments are planned twice per year with teachers, parents, and student involvement. Results from the assessments will be added to the data managements system to track progress.
- Documented ILP training for parents is expected to occur once during the school year. Follow-up training focusing on progress monitoring should occur at regular intervals throughout the year.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	15

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Evidence of Professional Development for staff to develop ILP: focuses upon identification/implementation of assessments, disaggregate data, and coaching. Year 1 focuses on differentiated practices and disaggregating assessment scores to develop baseline and determine strengths and weakness in student skills. Year 2 focuses on teacher effectivness and the chosen research based evaluation tool. The remaining two years of PD will focus on developing personal professional development plans for staff members utilizing the collected data from years one and two. Measurable goals, objectives and activities will be included. The proposed PD activities for the beginning of the timeline are efficiently written to address the use of baseline data in developing effective ILP plans. More detail regarding planned PD activities in Year 3 and 4 would be helpful while developing individualized learning plans for staff.
- Establishment of evaluation system: includes leadership model focused on student achievement and ILP completion, PD for staff, includes rubic to determine teacher and leader effectiveness to address the need for providing teachers with a tool for reflection into their own effectiveness and providing training to increase effectiveness.
- Description of evaluation system lacks detail regarding evaluation results: action plan for improvement based on summative evaluation results are not clarified
- Information needed regarding rating definitions and how targets are set to address continued improvement
- Evidence of established timeline: use of scaffolding training to meet teacher and leadership goals and the development of professional learning plans for individuals
- No evidence of the compilation of data regarding proposed evaluation system to focus on continued improvement/achievement

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	13

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- Evidence to support accountability standards by lead of consortium through outside vendors: grant manager
- DEPSA will hire a grant manager to ensure all vendors and participants meet requirements and make adequate progress toward outcome goals, facilitate advisory meetings, coordinate professional development, and lead the evaluation process.
- Information related to individual school autonomy and flexibility in the choice of evaluation models and student focused best practices is noted. Individual schools supported with assigned funding. A level of flexibility will be afforded to meet the needs of individualized school models.
- Consortium advisory council noted to support implementation of the plan: oversee financial elements, assessment, and data collection, and monitor best practices of individual participants including a mastery of learning foocus with the support of programming enhancement
- Information on the development and formation of school leadership teams to meet the specific and unique needs of each school was not provided.
- Evidence of individualized student focused educational plans to meet the needs of all student subgroups. Evidence provided to support a focus on mastery of learning includes extended school days, extended school year, blended learning models, and mixed age classrooms. Students have the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on the mastery of subject matter.
- Specific schools of the consortium have closed the achievement gap for ELL and students with disabilities through the use of visual learning models and differentiated instruction.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Planned activities to promote participation of all stakeholders is adequate. Face to face interaction and the usage of technological tools including Smart Phone accessability is in accordance with community standards and need.
- Detailed plan outlining the promotion of face to face contact to provide feedback to the community is incomplete. The literacy rate of stakeholders is limited and the plan does not provide sufficient support for parents or other stakeholders with limited literacy. There is no evidence that community resources have been explored to address literacy limitations in regard to providing technical support.
- The provided Accountability Matrix provides opportunities for reviewing the content of student ILP's but does not contain an appropriate level of technical suport measures for all stakeholders including parents.
- Data to demonstrate prior succes of parental/community involvement would be helpful to determine effectiveness as districts attempt to provide an appropriate level and forum in offering technical support related to the establishment of personalized learning environments.
- The applicant mentions the importance of performance management tools and student information systems working together in an interoperable data system but does not provided further information on how this will be accomplished.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- Key components of the continuous improvement plan is comprised of teacher and leader effectiveness, success of ILP completion, student academic achievement, stakeholder group satisfaction, and focus group meetings for suggestions and improvements.
- Limited frequency of measured progress related to indicators: specific monitoring strategies throughout length of timeline is needed: overall impact and effectiveness assessment and monitoring completed by contracted evaluator at conclusion of project
- Limited stakeholder involvement involvement in the Management Plan outline: community and state leader participation is absent from the plan but is noted as a key component to the continuous improvement plan.
- Focused attention of continuous internal improvement is noted in the form of the developement of leadership teams that include a curriculum development leader, differentiated instructional leader, parent engagement leader, and implementation coordinator.
- Public reporting of progress to all stakeholders is absent from Management Plan timeline although stakeholder group satisfaction is one of the listed key components of the continuous improvement plan.

- Continued progressive goals related to management plan noted: focused on professional development of staff, data collection, and formation of data driven ILP
- The timeline and list of activities in the Management Plan extend through the grant period. No evidence of continued growth assessment or monitoring strategies after the term of the grant is noted.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Internal stakeholder participation strong with clear goals established through proposed timeline: parent, teacher, and student surveys regarding their satisfaction with the RISE project will be distributed with responses shared with stakeholder groups to address needed adjustments. the collection of feedback from external stakeholders, including members of the community, is lacking.
- External stakeholder participation and opportunities for training and feedback is limited: noted low literacy rate of community members, plan lacks strategies to ensure participation of this population.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant has identified and chosen the performance measures to ensure the ongoing and purposeful evaluation of current student status. A more detailed rationale for the selection is needed.
- Performance measures assessed through research based state required assessments are noted. Social and emotional perfomance indicators will be measured one time per year and career and college readiness indicators will be measured independently at each participating school. More detail is needed in the narrative to address the rationale of the social and emotional performance measure as related to the identification of at-rsk students.
- Elements of data related to teacher/leader effectiveness and the number of students taught by effective or highly effective teachers is not provided. ILP completion in individual schools, Pre K-3 data, and subgroups was unavailable.
- Individual participating schools will use their own school level data to set annual target incators.
- Target measures will be adjusted once baseline data has been established at each participating school.
- A sufficient number of performance measures has not been provided to effectively determine whether the applicant has a clear and high quality approach to implementation.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- Evidence of effectiveness monitoring by third party: timeline in place for monitoring in Year 2, 3, and 4 to determine success by measures of level of growth for each objective: information to be shared with project managers
- Evidence of evaluation by individual participants: plan to review outcomes and performance measures: no timeline provided
- Clarification regarding the plan to use data to develop individual action plans to schools to address specific shortcomings to improve results incomplete: timeline and specfic requirements of individual advisory council not detailed in the effectiveness evaluation component
- Measures of effectiveness includes information gathered from students, teachers, and parents. External stakeholder participation related to the effectiveness of the investment, including state and local community leaders, is not clearly referenced.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	4

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- Due to undefined number of participating schools and information related to these additions, it is difficult to determine whether budget is sufficient: estimated budget per school provided for four year project period
- Projected salaries/benefits for personnel to only serve during grant period

- External TIP 3 grant referenced to suport budgetary information
- No funds from other sources used to support project. The applicant provides no commitment of any operating funds from the system itself. There is no clear evidence of funding support from within the organization itself.
- No evidence in budget to support long term sustainability of project
- The applicant identifies the funds that will support the project and provides a reasonable rationale for investments and priorities with descriptions of the funds to be used to support the implementation of the proposal. The budget for each year of the grant period includes budget categories and direct and indirect costs.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Noted proposed reconfiguration of state funding formula however no finalization at this time to support sustainability of project
- Unclear security of external funding sources to maintain the integrity of the proposal: secure state and federal funding is unknown which does not support the claim of sustainability
- The applicant notes that greater academic achievement will lead to additional state funding. The additional funding is not specified.
- The proposal does not provide clear evidence of funding support within its own organization.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

- No evidence of baseline data or target information provided
- Lack of explanation of existing collaboration with external organizations to integrate services
- Measurable desired result data incomplete
- Relationship between targeted population group, desired results, and educational impact undefined
- Lack of evidence to support stakeholder participation in development or support of proposal
- Needs assessment data incomplete
- Based on the very limited amount of information provided, it is difficult to determine whether a coherent and sustainable partnership has been formed or is in existence to support the proposal therefore the priority indicators have not been satisfied.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has coherently and comprehesively addressed how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college and career ready standards or college and career ready graduation requirements: accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student: increase the effectiveness of educators: expand student access to the most effective educators: decrease achievement gaps across student groups: increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers as evidenced by:

- Plan adequately addresses the consortium vision to increase college and career readiness through individualization of learning strategies
- Data collection and analysis strategies to support improved student achievement through the use of individualized learning plans

- Effective means to enhance assessment procedures in developing effectivepersonalized learning environments
- Data provided to support the selection and implementation of an evaluation system to improve instruction and leadership within individual schools (researched based model)
- Evidence to suggest reinforcement of career and college readiness standards through the use of personalized learning communities
- Addresses strategies to decrease achievement gaps beginning with baseline data collection

Total	210	125

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0495MI-2 for Edison Public School Academy

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has not set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on its work in the four core educational assurance areas and lacks evidence for the following:

1. Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed:

- Detroit Edison Public School Academy (DEPSA) plans to incorporate an educational vision and strategy that is unique to each student's needs.
- The applicant intends to identify and address gaps in individual student proficiency as measured by interim assessments and differentiated learning strategies implemented throughout the academic year.
- In addition to the state required and administered MEAP test, schools will also implement interim assessments at least three
  times per academic year. Each charter is required by their authorizer to administer either Performance Series or NWEA testing. If the
  authorizer does not require interim testing the default will be the Global Scholars Ed Performance Series test.
- DEPSA plans to meet students where they are, show them where they can be, and take them where they want to go through the implementation of the Reinventing and Individualizing Student Education (RISE) Program.
- It is unclear what the RISE program specifically embodies and how it will address standards and assessments.

2. Data systems that measure student growth and success and inform teachers and principals with data to improve instruction:

- They are proposing to use the RISE program that will increase the college and career readiness of students and teacher and leader capacity through the individualization of learning strategies and techniques.
- The applicant intends to provide students with assessment tools that identify learning styles, career and college goals, and academic interests.
- It is unclear what data systems will be used to inform teachers and principals.

3. Recruit, develop, reward, and retain effective teachers and principals:

- They support increased recruitment and retention of high quality staff by providing teacher incentive funds (TIF) linked to student outcomes
  and providing unique and competitive professional development opportunities. It should be noted the TIF funds are from a separate grant application of which DEPSA is a part.

4. Turn around low-achieving schools:

- They state they will address a number of issues facing educators today, including diverse cultural backgrounds, differing levels of student achievement, varied learning styles among students and alternative modes of educational delivery.
- RISE is reported to be the framework that allows for innovative approaches to building a culture of school improvement while providing a structure to ensure success.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has demonstrated a reasonably strong approach to implementing its reform proposal that will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation of that proposal as noted by:

- Their belief that a positive learning environment is essential for each child's development and that the child must experience success every
  day.
- The applicant sought to build a consortium of schools that bring a shared vision and experience in order to evaluate the impact that RISE can have on a multitude of environments and populations.
- The 14 participating academies share a similar foundational belief in effective education and bring an element of uniqueness to fit the needs of their student populations.
- This consortium will serve over 7,100 students with an average free/reduced lunch rate of about 65%.
- Further alignment within the consortium allows for relationships that may result in the sharing of students across LEAs, which is a necessary
  variable to prove the effectiveness of the Individual Learning Plan (ILP) model to be used.

While it is clear the the lead LEA has a strong approach to implementing its reform proposal, it is not entirely clear how this will be carried over to all the LEAs in the application.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The application includes a relatively high-quality plan describing how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools and will help the applicant reach its outcome goals as evidenced by:

- They state that RISE will be used as the framework that allows for innovative approaches to building a culture of school improvement while providing a structure to ensure success, but it is unclear what RISE actually is and how it works.
- They further state that RISE will be translated into meaningful reform supporting district-wide change beyond the participating schools, but present no evidence as to how this will be accomplished.
- It is noted that RISE schools will also participate in professional learning communities aimed at increasing the career and college readiness of their students.
- The RISE professional learning community will provide resources, knowledge, and best practices to help teachers at all schools, in all core
  subject areas adapt their curriculum to ensure career and college readiness.
- The professional learning community will also work to create a common Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) that can be accessed and is transferable across schools both within and outside of the consortium.
- The RISE hiring and retention model will increase the quality teaching staff at each school through a number of strategic initiatives.
- The RISE framework is stated to be completely transferrable to all schools nationwide and thus will improve learning outcomes for all students served by the applicant.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's vision is generally likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by:

- The applicant proposes ambitious, yet achievable performance increases on summative assessments:
  - Participating schools will implement interim assessments at least three times per academic year in addition to the

state required and administered test.

- ○ The applicant states each student's achievement status will be determined by their score on the state MEAP test, which is given in the fall of each year and will mimic the state's proficiency levels.
  - ○ Growth will be determined using the Performance Series or NWEA scores at least once during the academic year.
  - ○ Data is provided for each participating school and goals are established for each grade although it is unclear why 5% over the benchmark scores is the standard measure of progress for each school. Although achievable, this appears arbitrary and not supported by the narrative or tables.
- The applicant states the achievement gap will be calculated using the difference between the MEAP scores at the school and a corresponding comparison group at the state level. The information presented in the tables is the state level for each of the subgroups. In addition, schools will calculate the achievement gap between the student subgroups at their schools.
  - ○ The goal for reducing the achievement gaps will be to reduce the gap by 50% over the term of the grant. This is a reasonable, achievable goal given that the percent of subgroup students who rate proficient will have to increase at a rate that will get them to the target proficiency rate by the SY 2016/2017 school year.
- The applicant notes they will increase the number of students graduating by 10% over the previous year over the term of the grant. This does not appear to be a reasonable goal since they will quickly reach 100% which is an ideal goal, but not one easily achieved.
- College enrollment data was not available at the time of application.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	2

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not present a clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching. They note:

- DEPSA, the lead applicant, has shown innovation through growth in achievement over time. In each area tested in the statewide MEAP assessment, DEPSA has increased student achievement over the past four years. However, it is unclear how reforms will be achieved in lower performing schools.
- A subset of consortium schools have established high rates of achievement on state standardized tests in the face of rising "cut scores" by the state Department of Education, although it is unclear what schools constitute this subset. It is also not clear what other schools have managed to close or reduce the achievement gap in certain grades and subjects. Also, while they present objective data for one school, they do not provide any data on success rates for any of the other schools.
- The applicant states each participating LEA has made performance data an essential aspect of delivering individualized learning. Systems are in place to engage students, educators, and parents in the growth of students in comparison to the pathway set towards achieving goals. It is unclear what systems are in place to engage stakeholders.
- DEPSA provides students and teachers with access to student achievement, test results, grades, etc. via a student information system accessible through the school's website; however, it is not clear whether other LEAs in the application provide for the same degree of access.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	0

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has not shown a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments, including by making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration beyond that required by state law. They note:

- The Michigan Department of Education requires clearly articulated breakdowns of salaries and wages, employee benefit cost, retirement benefit costs, and other personnel costs. While specific breakdowns for teachers across subject areas is not required, it is required that the total salary and a description and cost of each fringe benefit included in the compensation package for the superintendent of the district and for each employee with a salary exceeding $100,000 be provided. This information is required to be easily accessible to the public. It is unclear what specific information beyond totals for each category, other than the superintendent and those earning salaries above $100,000, would be

- available to the public.
- Other information for instructional staff and teachers is required to be reported to the state, but it is not public information.
- The only other public information is defined as a clearly articulated breakdown on district expenditures including instruction, support services, business and administration, and operations and maintenance. It appears this may include LEA processes, practices, and investments; however, It is not articulated whether these include salaries. Further, it is not clearly delineated whether these practices are universal across all LEAs.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided limited evidence about the extent to which each LEA has demonstrated successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal. They state:

- The Detroit Edison Public School Academy and the participants in the consortium are given the status of LEA by the Michigan Department of Education. This provides for a Board of Directors with the autonomy to direct the delivery of education in a manner deemed most effective.
- Additionally, they note as a strength the non-existence of a unionized environment in an at-will employment situation. In being
  at-will employees, they state educators choose to work within a culture aligned with personal core values and beliefs. This may provide a certain degree of autonomy.
- Throughout this section, the DEPSA is highlighted and little is said about the other 13 participants beyond the statement that all participants within the consortium have the ability to respond to a community need, seek the capital for investment in a facility to allow for expansion, and to hire effective staff to serve a greater number of students.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has demonstrated evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal as noted by:

- Participating schools were asked to share the proposed model with key members of their staff who would become leaders and supporters of the model.
- Buy-in among teachers within schools is 100%.
- In schools in which there was a strong PTO organization, participants were able to share the model and proposed outcomes with parents in order to seek input on ILPs specifically.
- This proposal was built based on experience from a similar research project being completed in the state of Michigan by the Michigan Association of Public School Academies (MAPSA) which is leading a consortium in a teacher incentive fund model.
- Parent engagement is indicated on the provided forms and letters of support from teachers and leaders have been provided although it is unclear how parent involvement would occur.

It is noted in the appendix in the letter from MI Department of Education that this application is not in alignment with state standards and the applicant has not addressed this issue.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has formulated a high-quality plan for an analysis of their current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic
behind the reform proposal contained within their proposal, including identified needs and gaps that the plan will address as follows:

- DEPSA sought out to build a consortium of schools that bring a shared vision and experience of a model based on individualized learning in order to evaluate the impact that RISE can have on a multitude of environments and populations.
- Several of the participating schools are in the top 5% of performing schools and classified as "Reward" schools by the Michigan Department of Education and 60% of the participating schools are placed below the 50% on the top to bottom

- list.
- Each of the participants within the consortium has a form of an individualized learning model implemented, offering experience and evidence-based results.
- A clear management plan specifically for the development and implementation of the ILP model will be created and reported on quarterly by each participant.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	17

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has presented a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready as evidenced by:

- Michigan adopted a policy requiring that all public schools provide an opportunity for students to begin developing an Educational Development Plan (EDP) in Grade 7 and that every student has an EDP before entering high school. This EDP includes personal information, career goals, educational/training goals, assessment results, plan(s) of action, and parent consultation/endorsement through which each student identifies a career pathway and goals for achieving success. This is an effective way to outline a path to student goal achievement.
- The applicant notes the objectives of RISE encompass all of the Michigan requirements for college and career readiness planning and the
consortium seeks to implement an ILP model relevant to the entirety of the K-12 spectrum that drives student outcomes through student centered differentiated instruction. The ILP is a high quality tool that allows educators to plan, monitor, manage, and evaluate student achievement by identifying individual student needs and applying research-based interventions based on student needs.
- Through RISE, they intend to elevate the impact of an ILP through the implementation of the following differentiators: End User Philosophy, Integrated Supporting Curriculum, Alignment of Human Capital, Engagement and Process Strategy Among Stakeholders, and Performance Management Culture. These differentiators effectively involve students, educators, and parents in a team approach to learning.
- Various achievable measures and expectations that may be set in the RISE structure are presented and include: Activities, Frequency/Timeline, Responsible Personnel, and Measures of Success, as examples.
- While the use of an ILP is appropriate, the applicant does not specifically note how accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students will be accomplished.

	Available	Score
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	19

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has presented a strong high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready as shown by:

- Formulating an approach to teaching and leading that helps educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements by enabling the full implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all students through the use of:
  - The RISE program which will provide professional development to teachers on how to use disaggregated data from school
  MEAP scores, Student Achievement on Growth Measures, teacher observations and Individualized Learning Plans.
  - A group of Michigan charter schools are current recipients of a Federal Teacher Incentive Fund 4 Grant. Research into the
  TEAMs model has provided a number of optional evaluation tools that RISE consortium can take advantage of as they implement their ILP policies and practices by:
    • Using teacher stipends to encourage teachers to take on additional responsibilities
    • Providing bonuses or incentives to teachers that are deemed "highly effective"
    • Using video capture stations to evaluate teachers in their classroom environments.
- All participating educators will have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements as defined by:

- Acclimating teachers with differentiated instructional practices that increase the individualized nature of student learning and to provide students with a web-based ILP in which they can store assessment results, take career interest and learning style inventories, and develop long-term education, career and college readiness goals.
        - The applicant will contract with a vendor to provide the following professional development and tools to assist consortium schools in evaluating their students and implementing personalized learning strategies
        - Each year, teachers will hone in on a new concept and receive in depth training and support in that area.
    - Enabling all participating school leaders and school leadership teams to have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress through common and individual tasks toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements by:
        - Training each consortium school in how to implement web-based Individualized Learning Plans, administer career assessments, and identify student learning styles.
        - Each school will be required to implement their selected RISE Evaluation Rubric for Teacher and Principal Effectiveness in addition to existing models or in place of their existing model if it meets all of their requirements.   Of note is that the applicant mentions 15 schools here, but elsewhere it is noted there are 14 schools.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	9

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not present a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system with the support and resources they need to facilitate personalized learning, as evidenced by:

- The consortium will ultimately be led by DEPSA which will hire a grant manager in order to ensure that all vendors and participants are meeting requirements and making adequate progress towards outcome goals.
- The New Paradigm for Education Reform (NPFE) support office will ensure that grant compliance and reporting is upheld, allowing implementation to be the focus for DEPSA. A concern is that NPFE was co-founded by the writer of this grant and there may be a conflict-of-interest in employing this firm.
- DEPSA will contract with the Michigan Association of Public School Academies (MAPSA) to serve as grant manager to facilitate advisory meetings, coordinate professional development efforts, and lead the evaluation process.
- MAPSA has established the infrastructure necessary to promote stakeholder interaction and ensure proper support in implementation is provided to each participant.
- Schools will be supported with assigned funding to support the critical areas needing focus within each LEA.
- While the reimbursement process for expenses incurred by each LEA will be regulated in order to ensure that all funding is in alignment with established grant outcomes, there will be a level of flexibility offered to each school in support of their individualized model.
- The applicant notes RISE will be used to drive instruction based on specific needs.
- Other than the note that participating LEAs will offer varying levels of differentiated instruction, rules and policies to facilitate plan implementation for students with disabilities and English learners are not specifically mentioned.

The applicant does not indicate the involvement of any central office personnel to provide support and services; only outside vendors are noted as being part of the process for grant compliance and reporting.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA and school infrastructure supports personalized learning as evidenced by:

- A core element of their plan will be to evaluate mobile-friendly applications that will enable parent and student access easily through the technology they already are using.
- Training for and ongoing personal communication with parents will be necessary for them to have a full understanding of the ILP and to be empowered to support their child in it.
- An accountability matrix is provided and allows for various opportunities and formats for reviewing student ILPs.
- The framework of RISE is intended to help schools create processes that feed one another and produce intelligent data

with limited human interaction. The proposed evaluation methods are streamlined and widely accessible. Technology, such as the performance management tool and student information systems, must work together to produce data rich reporting and analytics. RISE will be used to create efficiency within systems, allowing for more timely knowledge and proactive addressing of challenges.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has an ambitious strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant, as shown by:

- DEPSA plans to implement a continuous improvement process that allows the consortium to be responsive to "lessons learned" as well as make changes necessary to address the potentially changing population at each school.
- Key components and data points of the RISE continuous improvement model are: Teacher/Leader Effectiveness Scores, ILP Completion, Student Academic Acheivement, social/emotional well-being measurement, Stakeholder group satisfaction, and Focus groups.
- A number of the performance measures and the student as the "end user" model proposed here do not currently exist in the majority of participating consortium schools, therefore teachers, leaders, parents, and students will take part in a number of activities regarding of participants and deliverables throughout the four year grant period.
- RISE consortium schools will be required to create a professional learning community within their schools and between schools. The individual school needs and interests will drive the content and activities of the PLC.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents comprehensive strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders as indicated by:

- Numerous resources will be established for various input opportunities among stakeholders including a website, social media, printed handbooks, thumb drives, and email directing stakeholders to key resources and making them aware of successes within the project.
- Survey and evaluation data will be collected as appropriate with ongoing feedback encouraged.
- Discussion boards for teachers, leaders, and other supportive roles in the schools will be created in order to encourage ongoing sharing of best practices.

	Available	Score
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures as described by:

- The RISE program will require the continued use of the required student growth assessments at least twice a year.
- Those schools not required to participate in additional accountability testing will chose from the two most common tests for 2-8 grades (PS and Northwest Educational Assessment's Measures of Academic Progress [NWEA MAP]) and the Explore, Plan, ACT testing suite for high school students (EPAS).
- The RISE consortium has selected a social/emotional well-being performance measure that identifies at-risk students and shows change over time.
- The RISE consortium consists of schools with varying missions and visions, so it will be up to each school to select their own indicators that can measure whether a student is on track to graduate or is ready for college or the workforce. The lead LEA and project manager will approve the selected indicators for each school which should provide for sufficient independence and adaptability to their student populations.
- The applicant states the charter school population is fluid, and determining the number of students in subsequent years was difficult for a large charter consortium. In addition, at the time of the grant proposal, limited data on teacher

effectiveness was available. This data reflects 6 out of 13 schools which have provided data which may not sufficiently meet this criterion.

- The RISE program will use a number of different performance measures meant to capture the influence of the differentiated
learning and individualized learning plans on student outcomes. However it is unclear what those measures will be or whether they will have the recommended total of 12-14 performance measures - they have listed 10 performance measures.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	4

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has appropriate plans to evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities,as shown by:

- DEPSA will contract with a third party evaluator to determine the success of the grant by measuring the level of growth in each project objective. It is not indicated who this third party evaluator will be or what criteria will be used for choosing a firm.
- DEPSA will contract with an education evaluation firm to evaluate the effectiveness of the RISE grant. The education evaluation firm is not named which makes it difficult how well the evaluation will be conducted, whether the firm is qualified to conduct this evaluation, or whether the firm would be independent enough to give meaningful feedback.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a table and narrative that identifies all funds that will support the project. There are no funds outside the RTTT-D that will be used for this project.

The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal and provides a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities.

The applicant notes since the number of participating schools is not entirely determined at this point within the review process, it is anticipated that the budget will be approximately $1,000,000 per school over the course of the 4-year program. This is not sufficient to determine the extent to which this criterion is met for each participating LEA.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents an undocumented tentative plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant based on:

- Michigan's governor has announced there will be a change to the funding formula by Spring 2013 that will go into effect for the 2013-14 school year. If the new formula were to bring charters to funding equity, this would result in a minimum increase of available per-pupil funds of $1,200.
- In addition, generating greater academic achievement will create two additional funding sources for the schools; the governor's funding formula will include performance pay and therefore schools reaching higher levels of performance will be given additional state funds. Second, the schools in this consortium are still growing and the ability to promote the academic achievement results will only add to their student enrollment which will increase funding.

The applicant does not provide documentation from State and local government leaders or indicate any sources of financial support outside of the consortium beyond a response from the Michigan Department of education which noted: the application appeared to be incomplete and it could not be determined if it aligned with the state initiatives. No responses were received from the eight city and township offices to which the application was sent.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**0**

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not present an adequate proposal to integrate public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students. However, they note:

- The RISE consortium will be using an instrument that has an adult component included in the subscription. At-risk students will be identified and their parents/guardians and siblings will be invited to take the assessment. The grant will provide access to a social worker or guidance counselor through online counseling session to work with families to help identify strategies for addressing risks and behaviors found in the instrument. The population addressed here are not participating students.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a reasonable, achievable plan that coherently and comprehensively addresses how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements; accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

	Available	Score
Total	**210**	**143**

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0495MI-3 for Edison Public School Academy

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	**10**	**10**

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The proposed plan, Reinventing and Individualizing Student Education, as described proposes to address individual student needs through strategies and initiatives that will support the four core educational assurance areas. To this end, the proposed project articulates the steps to reach the goals of accelerating student achievement while strengthening student learning based on individual needs. The applicant will carry out its change and reform vision by providing a personalized learning system, a strong teacher and principal management system, and intentional professional development.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant clearly describes the participating schools, provides the total number of schools (11) and students (7000+) in the consortium, and identifies the number and percent of students that are high need (4886) and low income (4884) as well as the total number of educators (367). The proposed approach provides assurances for implementing a reform proposal that supports alignment within the consortium for increased student support.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The plan, as described, mentions implementing a framework that will address a meaningful reform supporting district-wide change and one that will bring a necessary connectedness to the core areas that this grant proposes to address. The applicant does not, however, provide a more thorough discussion for how the proposed framework translates into meaningful reform or how the framework helps in reaching the outcome goals. There is no logic model or theory of change articulated that shows the project's assumptions for reaching the end goal.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	4

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The plan discusses a couple of initiatives it plans to incorporate, differentiated learning and individualized learning plans, but does not explain how the project will utilize these strategies to improve student outcomes. The applicant also indicates that professional learning communities are being planned targeting college and career-readiness of the students. As with the differentiated learning and individualized learning plans, the applicant does not provide specific detail that demonstrates how professional learning communities will be implemented or how this will likely improve student learning. Thus, the plan as outlined in this section did not provide sufficient detail that would support having ambitious or achievable goals for the areas of performance, decreasing achievement gaps, increasing graduation and college enrollment rates. The plan does provide data that shows percentage of growth from start to finish for all students and within certain subgoups.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	5

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The evidence provided by the applicant is primarily addressing one school within the consortium, DEPSA. This evidence includes data for the preceding four years that shows progress made in each of the state mandated core areas. While maintaining that each school participating in the consortium has made performance data an essential aspect of delivering individualized learning, the applicant has not provided evidence from all its participating schools indicative of progress made in closing achievement gaps or demonstrating ambitious reforms within low-performing schools. The applicant does indicate and provides information to show that systems are in place to engage students, educators and parents in the growth of students and that is readily makes available data and information on how students' grades and assessments are scored.

.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant indicates that it is following the state's Department of Education, which has implemented a statutory requirement related to the transparency of budget reporting, but does not require that this information be made public. The only requirement is that the information be only provided to the state Department of Education and the Michigan Registry of Personnel. Consequently, the applicant has not indicated that it has designed processes or practices making this information as transparent as possible to the public. It only follows what is required by the state's Department of Education.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The Detroit Edison Public School Academy, DEPSA, and its consortium schools have an LEA status granted to it by the state of Michigan. As such, DEPSA and its consortium of 11 schools have the same autonomy as granted to any other public school in the state. As such, this group of schools is granted governance via a Board of Directors with the autonomy to direct the delivery of education in a manner deemed most effective for governing each PSA. The applicant provides appropriate evidence to demonstrate successful conditions and autonomy for implementing the proposed project.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant includes signatures from teachers and parents whose children attend consortium schools endorsing the proposal. Limited information or evidence was given demonstrating how each of these stakeholders participated in the development of the project or its review. Furthermore, there is no mention for having included students throughout the process. In fact, it is not clear what groups or individuals participated in the development of the proposal including substantive support from key stakeholders such as parent organizations, student organizations or community and advocacy groups.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Once again, the applicant discusses the existence of a strong framework that incorporates processes that force integration within programs, engagement among stakeholders and data driven decision making for student and educator learning. And further indicates that each of the participants within the consortium has a form of an individualized learning model implemented that will offer experience and evidence based results. With regards to providing a high-quality plan for an analysis for the current status or the logic behind the proposal, the applicant only states that is it will built a purposeful analysis and networking around the individualized learning plan framework.

The applicant did not include any detail that addresses the project's timeline, the goals, activities, or deliverables. Additionally, the plan lacked any mention of gaps to be addressed by the plan.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides an appropriate rationale for its approach to learning by identifying research-based, best practices to meet the proposed plan. The plan also outlines a number of activities and what the applicant calls non-educational support services embedded into the proposed strategies that should help students develop college and career readiness goals, develop positive learning experiences, and develop appropriate learning skills. The applicant indicates all this to be achieved through the Individual Learning Plan developed for each student. The plan also proposes appropriate training opportunities for students and educators throughout the ILP process and provides an outline that details the activity, the responsible personnel, the frequency/timeline, and the measure of success. Furthermore, students will be provided exposure to various learning venues and instructional approaches such as field trips, an integrated supportive curriculum, and workplace observations, to name a few. While mentioning how individualized instruction would be tailored to meet the needs of all, there was relatively little information for how the plan is making accommodations or specific strategies for high-need students or for how the proposed ILP will be used to help high-need students stay on track toward meeting college and career-ready standards.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	20

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has outlined a comprehensive plan that proposes teachers and principals will receive instruction, training, and evaluations geared towards creating effective teachers and principals with increased capacity. The plan provides a training timeline, includes a teacher / principal evaluation rubric as well as measurements of teacher and principal effectiveness, student achievement, professional contributions, and ILP completion. The proposed plan is designed to help educators implement differentiated instructional strategies that meet the needs of individual student. Each will be trained accordingly and will have a number of assessment tools that will provide ongoing progress not just about whether the educator is understanding the material but also to assess progress made by the

students.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	6

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant indicates two separate entities will be guiding the project and did not identify a central office / consortium governance structure providing support and services to all. Rather, the New Paradigm for Education Reform will be the lead agency overseeing grant compliance and reporting and the Michigan Association of Public School Academies will be the grant manager and will facilitate advisory meetings, coordinate professional development efforts and lead the evaluation process. Because neither of these entities was mentioned as being involved in the development of the project and since both are outside contractors, the project's implementation may suffer. Further, it was not made clear the level of involvement each individual school has regarding such factors as school-level decision-making or what roles and responsibilities each has especially in light of the fact that the Michigan Association of Public School Academies, an outside contractor, is charged with grant management.

Additionally, the plan has not provided convincing evidence for how the consortium's policies and infrastructure would improve student opportunities nor did the plan provide a description of the types of resources and instructional practices it proposes to provide. The applicant merely mentions that each participating school has successful models in place that these would be shared with all. As regards to a high-quality plan, the plan lacks specificity and overall credibility. Two separate outside contracts will oversee grant management and grant implementation outside the central office or the consortium; individual schools will be asked to share best practice, thus, there is no one over-arching goal / strategy that ties it all together; and not a clearly stated rationale for why this approach was adopted. Furthernore, the plan did not outline in clearly specific terms what, if any, resources or instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to English learners and students with disabilities.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The plan outlined is not fully developed and does not completely demonstrate how the current or proposed infrastructure will be given appropriate technical support. Except for using smart phones and evaluating mobile-friendly applications, the applicant did not succintly develop a plan for how parents, students and educators would be assisted with appropriate resources to keep them informed of project and student progress. Furthermore, no specific information was included that shows how schools will have access to data systems. The applicant does provide a communication strategy that includes the activity, frequency/timeline, responsible individual, and measure of success.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has adopted a comprehensive plan that outlines goals, timeline and feedback to determine progress or corrective action and also identifies a sound strategy for monitoring, measuring, and sharing this information. Throughout the proposed plan, assessments will be gathered demonstrating student progress as well as demonstrating the impact and effectiveness of the project. The continuous process was clearly outlined via a quarterly calendar for each year with highlights of expected activities and outcomes.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant indicates that a number of venues and opportunities will be established and in place that provide assurances for open and ongoing communication and that will create input opportunities among stakeholders. Even though the applicant indicates having support mechanisms in place which will engage both internal and external stakeholders, the proposed communication and

engagement plan was vague and provides so specific strategies. The primary communication example provided by the applicant is the use of email used to inform stakeholders of key resources.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides an appropriate rationale for each measure selected. The applicant also includes expectations for how each will provide timely and rigorous information that will help address whether it has been successfully implemented. The plan also includes all the required measures for each grade level and for sub-groups being targeted. The applicant will also place a data coach at each school to help individual schools review and track progress. This will be on-going.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the funded activities was determined by placing a data coach at each school to help individual schools review and track progress, which the plan indicates that the review will be on-going. Beyond this, the applicant did not elaborate for how the use of resources, time, staff or funds have been carefully designed that demonstrate an effective use of investments. The plan does not address how the applicant would bring in community partners or how it addresses specific strategies representative of a quality plan.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The proposed budget has only identified funds from the RTT-D program and did not address other sources from areas such as local or state funds or from external foundation sources. While providing a narrative for each year that funds are being requested, the request for funds in some of the budget categories do not appear to be a reasonable use of funds. For example, funds the applicant seeks for legal and financial services do not appear to be an appropriate use of RTT-D priority. The proposed budget, while having numerous line items within each of the categories, appears to be unrealistic in supporting the development and implementation of the proposal especially in light of the fact that the applicant's plan did not have a coherent plan that showed a common thread connecting all the schools into one over-arching plan.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not provide a description for how the project will be sustained beyond the grant's funding. It also did not indicate that other funds from state or local government are providing leadership or financial support. The proposed budget is not cost effective and does not appear to be appropriate for the project. The applicant is only proposing possibilities should the governor's proposed changes to the funding formula take effect. Thus, the applicant is not proposing a high-quality plan for sustainability. The applicant is simply stating that a new source of funding may come to charter schools if the governor's funding changes happen. With respect to financial support from state and local government leaders, the applicant states that the work carried by principals and boards for tracking overall success will align dollars having significant impact on student achievement. These is not conclusive evidence demonstrating a high quality plan; furthermore, the narrative provided does not include goals, activities, timelines, deliverables or responsible personnel.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	1

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not address how it plans to integrate public resources and did not mention a partnership with other entities in an effort to maximize

resources especially with respect to supporting the students' and family's social/emotional or behavioral needs. In fact, there was no plan that addressed the criterion. In all, the only item the applicant addressed was to provide one population-level measure. The applicant mentions that it will target the at-risk student and family with the desired result that each will be given increased accessed to tools and referral for social welfare supports. This, however, did not address how it will be measured or tracked. Furthermore, what was provided did not demonstrate an alignment with and support for the RTT-D proposal.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has presented ideas that suggest the plan to be a coherent one. Having said this, the applicant's proposed plan is poorly designed, did not appear to have involvement from all 14 schools or from significant stakeholders such as community partners. The applicant identified successful models and researched best practice, however, it was not able to pull it into a coherent and feasible plan. Much of the design was focused on meeting the needs of what appears to be the main school, Detroit Edison Public School Academy. The plan also failed to adequately address how it would turn around its lowest-achieving schools or how it plans to build a data system that measures growth and success. Not enough discussion was provided to determine how a data system would be used to inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction.

Total	210	133